UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/716,522	11/20/2003	Kazuhito Tanimoto	117823	6870

25944 7590 12/22/2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 320850
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, ALLEN H	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/22/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/716,522	TANIMOTO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Allen H. Nguyen	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 October 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,8,9 and 11-26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,8,9 and 11-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *20 November 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *09/11/2008*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 09/11/2008 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 10/02/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3. With respect to applicants 'arguments that "Lobiondo, Farrell, Akiyama and well known prior art, either alone or in any combination, do not disclose or suggest predetermined relation information pertaining to a plurality of types of commands, each type of command corresponding to a single source device and one or more transmission destination devices .... the transmission destination devices being different in type from each other and from the corresponding source device, as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 9 and 12".

In reply: Regarding claim 1, Lobiondo '194 discloses a communication controller (Print Server 60, fig. 1), which can communicate with each of the plurality of processing devices (Printers 10, fig. 1), having a memory in which predetermined relation information is stored (i.e., memory containing information relating to each printer, such as printer type, quality, speed, document size, capability, etc. This information is the

basic information which does not usually change; Col. 4, lines 1-15),

the predetermined relation information pertaining to a plurality of types of commands (i.e., type of document, sizing criteria, formatting, margins, where copies are to be sent, etc; Col. 3, lines 50-55 and col. 4, lines 50-55),

each type of command corresponding to a single source device (Workstation 30 sent the print job, fig. 1, col. 3, lines 50-60) and one or more transmission destination devices (i.e., a user at one of the workstations 30 of the network enters a request to print a job, sends the print job data to a network print spooler 60/printer 10, and enters all necessary criteria which is stored in an input data file in memory; Col. 3, lines 55-60),

each of the single source device (Workstation 30, fig. 1) and the one or more transmission destination devices being one of the plurality of processing devices (Printers 10, fig. 1),

each of the single source devices (Workstation 30, fig. 1) transmitting the command to corresponding one or more transmission destination devices (i.e., a plurality of workstations 30 are present at various locations within the network from which inputs for jobs to be printed can be entered; Col. 3, lines 25-30 and col. 3, lines 45-50),

the transmission destination devices (Printers 10, fig. 1) being different in type from each other and from the corresponding single source device (i.e., printers of the type capable of producing the job are checked for availability; Col. 4, lines 50-65),

wherein,

when the communication controller (Print Server 60, fig. 1) receives the

command transmitted from any one of the plurality of processing devices (i.e., the printer can complete the job by the required time (step 440); Col. 6, lines 55-60, fig. 4), based on the received command and the predetermined relation information (i.e., the job length (step 420) based on the number of copies, the particular machine, printing parameters such as simplex or duplex, etc; Col. 6, lines 53-55), the communication controller selects the one or more transmission destination devices (i.e., the print server 60 examines the printer queue (step 430) and determines if the printer can complete the job by the required time (step 440). If the job can be completed on time the job is allocated to the printer (step 450); Col. 6, lines 55-60, fig. 4), and transmits the received command to the one or more selected, transmission destination devices (i.e., the portion of the job that can be completed by the printer is allocated (step 425); Col. 6, lines 65-68 and col. 7, lines 1-10, fig. 4).

4. With respect to applicants 'arguments that "Lobiondo, Farrell, Akiyama and well known prior art, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest predetermined relation information, as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 9 and 12".

In reply: Regarding claim 1, Lobiondo '194 discloses a communication controller (Print Server 60, fig. 1), which can communicate with each of the plurality of processing devices (Printers 10, fig. 1), having a memory in which predetermined relation information is stored (i.e., memory containing information relating to each printer, such

as printer type, quality, speed, document size, capability, etc. This information is the basic information which does not usually change; Col. 4, lines 1-15).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 9, applicants claim wherein the plurality of devices. It is unclear what particular devices that is being claimed that the plurality device is referring to. E.g., the transmission destination devices or the processing devices etc.

Regarding claims 11, 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being depend on rejected base claim 9.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-2, 8-9, 11-13, 20, 23, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lobiondo (US 5,287,194) or under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in view of Evanitsky et al. (US 5,045,880)(column 4, lines 40-45, Lobiondo states: 5,045,880 to Evanitsky, the disclosures of which are incorporated herein by reference).

Regarding claim 1, Lobiondo '194 discloses an image forming system (Fig. 1) comprising:

a plurality of processing devices (Printers 10, fig. 1) including at least:

an image forming device (Machine 5, fig. 3 of Evanitsky '880) which forms an image (Sides Imaged 310, fig. 10 of Evanitsky '880);

a control device (Controller 114, fig. 3 of Evanitsky '880) which controls an operation of the image forming device based on an instruction input through a user interface (U.I. 213, fig. 3 of Evanitsky '880);

an input device (User Interface 213, figs. 3, 6 of Evanitsky '880) which inputs the image data;

a communication controller (Print Server 60, fig. 1), which can communicate with each of the plurality of processing devices (Printers 10, fig. 1), having a memory in

which predetermined relation information is stored (i.e., memory containing information relating to each printer, such as printer type, quality, speed, document size, capability, etc. This information is the basic information which does not usually change; Col. 4, lines 1-15),

the predetermined relation information pertaining to a plurality of types of commands (i.e., type of document, sizing criteria, formatting, margins, where copies are to be sent, etc; Col. 3, lines 50-55 and col. 4, lines 50-55),

each type of command corresponding to a single source device (Workstation 30 sent the print job, fig. 1, col. 3, lines 50-60) and one or more transmission destination devices (i.e., a user at one of the workstations 30 of the network enters a request to print a job, sends the print job data to a network print spooler 60/printer 10, and enters all necessary criteria which is stored in an input data file in memory; Col. 3, lines 55-60),

each of the single source device (Workstation 30, fig. 1) and the one or more transmission destination devices being one of the plurality of processing devices (Printers 10, fig. 1),

each of the single source devices (Workstation 30, fig. 1) transmitting the command to corresponding one or more transmission destination devices (i.e., a plurality of workstations 30 are present at various locations within the network from which inputs for jobs to be printed can be entered; Col. 3, lines 25-30 and col. 3, lines 45-50),

the transmission destination devices (Printers 10, fig. 1) being different in type from each other and from the corresponding single source device (i.e., printers of the

type capable of producing the job are checked for availability; Col. 4, lines 50-65), wherein,

when the communication controller (Print Server 60, fig. 1) receives the command transmitted from any one of the plurality of processing devices (i.e., the printer can complete the job by the required time (step 440); Col. 6, lines 55-60, fig. 4), based on the received command and the predetermined relation information (i.e., the job length (step 420) based on the number of copies, the particular machine, printing parameters such as simplex or duplex, etc; Col. 6, lines 53-55), the communication controller selects the one or more transmission destination devices (i.e., the print server 60 examines the printer queue (step 430) and determines if the printer can complete the job by the required time (step 440). If the job can be completed on time the job is allocated to the printer (step 450); Col. 6, lines 55-60, fig. 4), and transmits the received command to the one or more selected, transmission destination devices (i.e., the portion of the job that can be completed by the printer is allocated (step 425); Col. 6, lines 65-68 and col. 7, lines 1-10, fig. 4).

Regarding claim 2, Lobiondo '194 discloses the image forming system (Fig. 1), wherein the communication controller (Print server 60, fig. 1) selects the control device (Controller 114, fig. 3 of Evanitsky '880) and the input device (U.I. 213, fig. 3 of Evanitsky '880) as transmission destination devices destinations (Printer 10, fig. 1) when the received command is a command from the image forming device which requests the image data to be transferred in response to the time the image is formed

(i.e., the system providing communication with the user to confirm that each location can complete the desired job and the time at which the job will be completed; Col. 2, lines 35-40 and col. 6, lines 55-60, fig. 4 with S440).

Regarding claim 8, Lobiondo '194 discloses the image forming system (fig. 1), wherein the communication controller is arranged in the image forming device (i.e., the reprographic machine 30 generally includes a scanner section 35, a controller section 45, and a printer section 55; see col. 5, line 68 and col. 6, lines 1-2, fig. 2).

Regarding claim 9, Lobiondo '194 discloses a communication control device (Print Server 60, fig. 1) included in the image forming system (Fig. 1), the communication control device comprising:

a plurality of communication controllers (communication channels of communication link 20 of print server 60, fig. 1) corresponding to each of a plurality of processing devices (Printers 10, fig. 1) included in the image forming system (Fig. 1);

a memory in which predetermined relation information is stored (i.e., memory containing information relating to each printer, such as printer type, quality, speed, document size, capability, etc. This information is the basic information which does not usually change; Col. 4, lines 1-15),

the predetermined relation information pertaining to a plurality of types of commands (i.e., type of document, sizing criteria, formatting, margins, where copies are to be sent, etc; Col. 3, lines 50-55 and col. 4, lines 50-55),

each type of command corresponding to a single source device (Workstation 30 sent the print job, fig. 1, col. 3, lines 50-60) and one or more transmission destination devices (i.e., a user at one of the workstations 30 of the network enters a request to print a job, sends the print job data to a network print spooler 60/printer 10, and enters all necessary criteria which is stored in an input data file in memory; Col. 3, lines 55-60), each of the single source device (Workstation 30, fig. 1) and the one or more transmission destination devices being one of the plurality of processing devices (Printers 10, fig. 1),

each of the single source devices (Workstation 30, fig. 1) transmitting the command to corresponding one or more transmission destination devices (i.e., a plurality of workstations 30 are present at various locations within the network from which inputs for jobs to be printed can be entered; Col. 3, lines 25-30 and col. 3, lines 45-50),

the transmission destination devices (Printers 10, fig. 1) being different in type from each other and from the corresponding single source device (i.e., printers of the type capable of producing the job are checked for availability; Col. 4, lines 50-65),

a controller (Print server 60, fig. 1) which selects one or more of the processing devices as a transmission destination device (i.e., the print server 60 examines the printer queue (step 430) and determines if the printer can complete the job by the required time (step 440). If the job can be completed on time the job is allocated to the printer (step 450); Col. 6, lines 55-60, fig. 4) when a command is transmitted from any one of the plurality of processing devices through the communication controller

corresponding to the one or more selected, transmission destination devices (i.e., the portion of the job that can be completed by the printer is allocated (step 425); Col. 6, lines 65-68 and col. 7, lines 1-10, fig. 4), based on the received command and the predetermined relation information (i.e., the job length (step 420) based on the number of copies, the particular machine, printing parameters such as simplex or duplex, etc; Col. 6, lines 53-55), and which transmits the received command to the one or more selected transmission destination devices through the communication controller corresponding to the one or more selected transmission destination devices (i.e., the print server 60 checks for any available printers (step 445) and allocated to the available printer (step 465. The process then repeats by reverting to step 420, where the job length of the remaining job portion is determined; Col. 7, lines 1-10, fig. 4),

wherein the plurality of devices (Printers 10, fig. 1) includes at least:

an image forming device (Machine 5, fig. 3 of Evanitsky '880) that forms an image (Sides Imaged 310, fig. 10 of Evanitsky '880);

a control device (Controller 114, fig. 3 of Evanitsky '880) that controls an operation of the image forming device based on an instruction input through a user interface (U.I. 213, fig. 3 of Evanitsky '880);

an input device that inputs the image data (User Interface 213, figs. 3, 6 of Evanitsky '880).

Regarding claim 11, Lobiondo '194 discloses the communication control device (Print Server 60, fig. 1), wherein the communication control device is arranged in the

image forming device (i.e., the reprographic machine 30 generally includes a scanner section 35, a controller section 45, and a printer section 55; see col. 5, line 68 and col. 6, lines 1-2, fig. 2).

Regarding claims 12-13, 26, claims 12-13, 26 are method claims of device claims 1-2, 20 respectively. Therefore, claims 12-13, 26 are rejected with the reason given in claims 1-2, 20.

Regarding claim 20, Lobiondo '194 discloses the image forming system (Fig. 1), wherein each type of command corresponding to the single source device and two or more different types of transmission destination devices (the entered information can include information relating to the time when the work is desired to be completed, as well as other criteria such as type of document, sizing criteria, formatting, margins, where copies are to be sent, etc. A user at one of the workstations 30 of the network enters a request to print a job, sends the print job data to a network print spooler 60, and enters all necessary criteria which is stored in an input data file in memory. Depending on the type of data to be printed, i.e., facsimile, E-mail transfer, copy, etc., the criteria that needs to be entered for each job can vary; Col. 3, lines 50-63 and col. 4, lines 50-55).

Regarding claim 23, Lobiondo '194 discloses the communication control device (Print server 60, fig. 1), wherein each type of command corresponding to a single

source device and two or more different types of transmission destination devices (the entered information can include information relating to the time when the work is desired to be completed, as well as other criteria such as type of document, sizing criteria, formatting, margins, where copies are to be sent, etc. A user at one of the workstations 30 of the network enters a request to print a job, sends the print job data to a network print spooler 60, and enters all necessary criteria which is stored in an input data file in memory. Depending on the type of data to be printed, i.e., facsimile, E-mail transfer, copy, etc., the criteria that needs to be entered for each job can vary; Col. 3, lines 50-63 and col. 4, lines 50-55).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 3-5, 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lobiondo (US 5,287,194) in view of Evanitsky et al. (US 5,045,880), and further in view of well known prior art.

Regarding claims 3-4, Lobiondo '194 discloses the image forming system (Fig. 1), wherein the communication controller (the print server 60, fig. 1):

selects the image forming device (remote printers 10, col. 2, line 23, fig. 1) as a transmission destination device when the received command is a command from the control device (Controller 114, fig. 3 of Evanitsky '880) which requests a diagnosis of the state of the image forming device (i.e., the scheduler 50 of the print server 60 can establish communication between a user and the system to request entering of criteria; see col. 6, lines 16-18),

Lobiondo differs from the claim 3, in that he does not explicitly teach which requests a diagnosis of the state of the image forming device and provides notification of the state of the image forming device as a result of the diagnosis.

However, it is well known in the art to: requests a diagnosis of the state of the image forming device and provides notification of the state of the image forming device as a result of the diagnosis (official notice).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the system of Lobiondo and Evanitsky to include: requests a diagnosis of the state of the image forming device and provides notification of the state of the image forming device as a result of the diagnosis.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because the user would know how and when the machine is broken and can fix the problem.

Regarding claims 5, 16, the combination of Lobiondo '194 and Evanitsky '880 '426 does not explicitly show wherein the communication controller selects a device

which performs at least some of processes for performing image control to adjust an image formed by the image forming device as a transmission destination device when the received command is a command from the image forming device which provides information on the formed image.

However it is well known in the art to: wherein the communication controller selects a device which performs at least some of processes for performing image control to adjust an image formed by the image forming device as a transmission destination device when the received command is a command from the image forming device which provides information on the formed image (official notice).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the system of Lobiondo and Evanitsky to include: wherein the communication controller selects a device which performs at least some of processes for performing image control to adjust an image formed by the image forming device as a transmission destination device when the received command is a command from the image forming device which provides information on the formed image.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the system of Lobiondo and Evanitsky because it allows the user to adjust the printer remotely.

Regarding claims 14-15, claims 14-15 are the method claims of device claims 3-4, respectively. Therefore, claims 14-15 are rejected with the reason given in device claims 3-4.

11. Claims 6, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lobiondo (US 5,287,194) in view of Evanitsky et al. (US 5,045,880), and further in view of Akiyama et al. (US 5,594,653).

Regarding claim 6, the combination of Lobiondo '194 and Evanitsky '880 does not explicitly show the image forming system, wherein the communication controller selects any one of the control device and the input device as a transmission destination device when the received command is a command from the image forming device which provides notification that the image data and the formed image match with each other, and selects both the control device and the input device as transmission destination devices when the received command is a command from the image forming device, which provides notification that the image data and the formed image do not match with each other.

However, Akiyama teaches to send a command from a printer to an image input device to request for data when the formed image with each other (col. 16, lines 60-67, col. 17, lines 1-5, fig. 13) and send a command from the printer to both the input device (to stop the input device from sending data, col. 3, lines 13-15) and the user (control

device, to notify user about the error; Col. 3, lines 25-30) when the formed image does not match with each other (107 and 110, fig. 10; col. 15, lines 30-40)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the system of Lobiondo and Evanitsky to include: wherein the communication controller selects any one of the control device and the input device as a transmission destination device when the received command is a command from the image forming device which provides notification that the image data and the formed image match with each other, and selects both the control device and the input device as transmission destinations when the received command is a command from the image forming device, which provides notification that the image data and the formed image do not match with each other.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the system of Lobiondo and Evanitsky because: It will notify the user that there is a printing error and at the same time prevent the input device to continue to send data can not be printed to prevent loss of resources.

Regarding claim 17, claim 17 are the method claim of device claim 6. Therefore, claim 17 is rejected with the reason given in device claim 6.

12. Claims 18-19, 21-22, 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lobiondo (US 5,287,194) / Evanitsky et al. (US 5,045,880), and in view of Farrell (US 6,873,426).

Regarding claim 18, Lobiondo '194 discloses the image forming system (Fig. 1), wherein the image forming device (Printer 10, figs. 1-2) forms the image including a code based on image data (i.e., all of the control code and screen display information for the machine 5; Col. 7, lines 30-31, fig. 18 of Evanitsky '880),

the input device (Modem 25, fig. 1) transfers the image data to the selected image forming device (Printers 10, fig. 1) via the communication control device (Print Server 60, fig. 1) without routing through the control device (Workstation 30, fig. 1) based on the relation information when a command is input to the input device (i.e., the network from which inputs for jobs to be printed can be entered; Col. 3, lines 28-35, fig. 1),

Lobiondo '194 does not explicitly show the selected image forming device includes a sensor for reading the code from the formed image, the image forming device comparing the formed image with the image data for a matching check using the code.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are well known in the art as evidenced by Farrell '426. In particular, Farrell '426 teaches wherein the selected image forming device (Printer 16, fig. 2) includes a sensor (Place Marker Relative to Print Job 60, fig. 3) for reading the code from the formed image (i.e., the markers can be

configured as machine-readable and/or human readable descriptions of the desired finishing printed on the edge of oversized output media or on pages containing job content, for example, by watermark, glyph, barcode and the like; Col. 5, lines 30-35), the image forming device comparing the formed image with the image data for a matching check using the code (i.e., a processor in communication with both the user interface and the finishing element determines compatibility between the finishing element and the desired finishing instruction. Upon a determination of incompatibility, a compatible finishing instruction for the finishing element is then selected; Col. 2, lines 62-67).

In view of the above, having the system of Lobiondo and Evanitsky and then given the well-established teaching of Farrell, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Lobiondo and Evanitsky as taught by Farrell to include: wherein the selected image forming device includes a sensor for reading the code from the formed image, the image forming device comparing the formed image with the image data for a matching check using the code, since Farrell stated in col. 1, lines 25-30 that such a modification would ensure increasingly today printers are fitted with finishing terminals capable of providing a limited selection of finishing capabilities. Use of these printers can reduce the number of steps needed, i.e. the number of machines to which the print job must be transported, to complete a particular job.

Regarding claim 19, Lobiondo '194 discloses the image forming system (Fig. 1), wherein the selected image forming device transmits the command to both of the control device and the input device based on the relation information when the formed image is inconsistent with image data (i.e., printers 10 send command through print server by confirmation back to the user that the job is either being printed at one or more locations, will be printed at a determined location at a later time, or cannot meet the entered criteria and as such cannot print the job; Col. 6, lines 30-35).

Regarding claim 21, Lobiondo '194 discloses the communication control device (Print server 60, fig. 1), wherein

the image forming device (Printer 10, figs. 1-2) forms the image including a code based on image data (i.e., all of the control code and screen display information for the machine 5; Col. 7, lines 30-31, fig. 18 of Evanitsky '880),

the input device (Modem 25, fig. 1) transfers the image data to a selected image forming device (Printers 10, fig. 1) via the communication control device (Print Server 60, fig. 1) without routing through the control device (Workstation 30, fig. 1) based on the relation information when a command is input to the input device (i.e., the network from which inputs for jobs to be printed can be entered; Col. 3, lines 28-35, fig. 1),

Lobiondo '194 does not explicitly show the selected image forming device includes a sensor for reading the code from the formed image, the image forming device comparing the formed image with the image data for a matching check using the code.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are well known in the art as evidenced by Farrell '426. In particular, Farrell '426 teaches the selected image forming device (Printer 16, fig. 2) includes a sensor (Place Marker Relative to Print Job 60, fig. 3) for reading the code from the formed image (i.e., the markers can be configured as machine-readable and/or human readable descriptions of the desired finishing printed on the edge of oversized output media or on pages containing job content, for example, by watermark, glyph, barcode and the like; Col. 5, lines 30-35), the image forming device comparing the formed image with the image data for a matching check using the code (i.e., a processor in communication with both the user interface and the finishing element determines compatibility between the finishing element and the desired finishing instruction. Upon a determination of incompatibility, a compatible finishing instruction for the finishing element is then selected; Col. 2, lines 62-67).

In view of the above, having the system of Lobiondo and Evanitsky and then given the well-established teaching of Farrell, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Lobiondo and Evanitsky as taught by Farrell to include: the selected image forming device includes a sensor for reading the code from the formed image, the image forming device comparing the formed image with the image data for a matching check using the code, since Farrell stated in col. 1, lines 25-30 that such a modification would ensure increasingly today printers are fitted with finishing terminals capable of providing a limited selection of finishing capabilities. Use of these printers can reduce the number

of steps needed, i.e. the number of machines to which the print job must be transported, to complete a particular job.

Regarding claim 22, Lobiondo '194 discloses the communication control device (Print server 60, fig. 1), wherein the selected image forming device transmits the command to both of the control device and the input device based on the relation information when the formed image is inconsistent with image data (i.e., printers 10 send command through print server by confirmation back to the user that the job is either being printed at one or more locations, will be printed at a determined location at a later time, or cannot meet the entered criteria and as such cannot print the job; Col. 6, lines 30-35).

Regarding claims 24- 25, claims 24-25 are the method claims of device claims 18- 19 respectively. Therefore, claims 24- 25 are rejected with the reason given in device claims 18-19.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Reed et al. (US 5,130,806) discloses job comment/operator messages for an electronic reprographic printing system.

Nakahara et al. (US 5,434,650) discloses system for transmitting a message including user request from image forming unit to management unit.

Miyawaki (US 6,032,001) discloses remote diagnosis system and method for an image forming apparatus.

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Allen H. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571)270-1229. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM-6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, KING Y. POON can be reached on (571) 272-7440. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/King Y. Poon/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/Allen H. Nguyen/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625